

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office

April 10, 2000 LB 179, 301, 1279

is this, though. The facts are it was passed out with the "or" in it; the Department of Revenue changed it. You have people out there who, even for one year, under the way the law now states, would qualify for it. In this case that family would qualify for the \$775. We made a mistake. Who pays? I...I don't believe it should be the family, if it's just for one year, and we have to go back and change it, if that's not the intent, that here takes the time to read it, feel that they're going to get some relief, only to find out, on our error, that they do not get that relief. And so that's realizing that we would have to come back and have the Revenue Committee look at it. I think always the intention of the Revenue Committee was to narrow the definition and not have it be the impact of the \$14 million. But we did it and that's what the discussion is about at this point. Thank you.

PRESIDENT MAURSTAD: Thank you, Senator Bohlke. Senator Bourne.

SENATOR BOURNE: Thank you, Mr. President. Again, I'll just kind of give you a brief history of this, just so that we're all on the same page. And I pushed my light before the amendment came on, because I didn't know where I'd be in the process. But again, back in 1998, Senator Peterson introduced a bill which was modified by the committee in a committee amendment, AM3232, that had the "or" language in there. So, it reads, or the committee amendment says "use of a mechanical aid or prosthesis or who have a permanent partial disability of both arms", et cetera. So it has the "or" language in there, in 1998; that bill did not get adopted. In 1999, Senator Chris Peterson again introduced LB 301 that had that language, the "or" language in there, and that, by committee amendment, was merged into LB 179 with the "or" language; went through three levels of debate and to my knowledge nobody tried to take the "or" out on the floor. So I don't see how we...I mean I knew that, to be quite honest, I knew that it was in there, that it said "or", so...not that that means a heck of a lot, but I don't believe that this was a mistake is what I'm trying to get at. So, I hope you'd support the amendment. We're talking about people like Senator Bohlke mentioned, people who have serious heart conditions that are unable to work, perhaps stroke people, things of that nature that maybe they cannot work, but they don't qualify because they don't use prostheses. I'd support the...I urge your adoption of